

**REMARKS**

Claims 15-17, 19-24, 33 and 34 are pending in this application.

By this Amendment, claim 15 is amended to recite additional features. See paragraph [0055] and Figs. 1-8 of the present application (US2006/0122700). No new matter is added. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 15-17, 19-24, 33 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,468,306 to Paul in view of JP 09-276303 to Hoya. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 15 is amended to recite additional features, as outlined above. For example, claim 15 recites, among other things, "the support portion is made of PMMA and serves as arm-shaped support members extended toward outside from parts of a peripheral edge of the optic portion." This additional feature emphasizes that claim 15 differs from Paul and Hoya in having the feature "there is no step on the anterior surface of the lens in the boundary between the optic portion and the support portion."

Here, as pointed out in the Office Action, Paul discloses that fixation members 24a and 24b as the fixation members may be of other configurations and/or may be separate members affixed to the optic 22 in any of a variety of conventional ways. However, Paul does not disclose concrete positional relation between fixation members 24 and optic 22, but discloses only structure of "there is a step on the anterior surface of the lens in the boundary between the optic portion and the support portion" in Fig. 14a. Hoya also discloses only structure of "there is a step on the anterior surface of the lens in the boundary between the optic portion and the support portion" in Fig. 2. Furthermore, as explained below, Lagquette does not disclose a haptic-shaped support portion, but disclosed only a membranal support portion. From these disclosures in the cited references, it can be said that the Office Action's indication of "Since Paul explicitly discloses the haptics may be positioned in any

conventional manner, the use of haptics positioned in a smooth manner with the anterior surface is well known in the art" is inappropriate. Thus, Paul and Hoya do not disclose or render obvious the subject matter recited in claim 15, as amended.

Regarding "there is no step on the anterior surface of the lens in the boundary between the optic portion and the support portion" already recited in claim 15, the Office Action mentions U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0161434 to Laguette. In particular, the Office Action asserts that, with regard to a limitation "there is no step on the anterior surface of the lens in the boundary between the optic portion and the support portion," haptics positioned in a smooth manner with the anterior surface is well known in the art, as shown in Laguette. This assertion is respectfully traversed.

It appears that this Office Action assertion is based on Figs. 5-7 to Laguette. Figs. 5-7 of Laguette, however, are sectional views of Fig. 4, and it is clear from the explanation of Fig. 4 that Laguette discloses only that a periphery of optic portion is surrounded with a membranal support portion. That is to say, Laguette never discloses "haptics positioned in a smooth manner with the anterior surface" as asserted in the Office Action.

Accordingly, since Laguette discloses only an intraocular lens quite different from Paul or Hoya in a shape of support portion, one of ordinary skill would not have had a reasonable rationale to combine the technique disclosed in Laguette and the technique disclosed in Paul or Hoya. Moreover, in view of the arguments presented in the May 6, 2010 Amendment, since the limitations "the support portion is made of PMMA and serves as arm-shaped support members extended toward outside from parts of a peripheral edge of the optic portion, and there is no step on the anterior surface of the lens in the boundary between the optic portion and the support portion" are not disclosed in Laguette, Paul, or Hoya, Laguette, Paul, or Hoya, even if combined, do not disclose or render obvious the subject matter recited in claim 15.

Furthermore, as argued in the previously filed Amendment, claim 15 can achieve the unique effect which cannot be attained by Paul or Hoya.

For at least the above reasons, claim 15 is patentable over the applied references. Claims 16, 17, 19-24, 33 and 34 are also patentable over the applied references at least in view of the patentability of claim 15, from which they depend, as well as for additional features they recite. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 15-17, 19-24, 33 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 15-17, 19-24, 33 and 34 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Gang Luo  
Registration No. 50,559

JAO:GL/kjb

Attachments:

Request for Continued Examination  
Petition for Extension of Time

Date: November 17, 2010

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 320850**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION</b> Please grant any extension necessary for entry of this filing; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--